CLICK HERE FOR CEO's VERBAL REPORT DATED AUGUST 25, 2009

CLICK HERE FOR CEO's REPORT DATED NOVEMBER 2, 2009

CLICK HERE FOR CEO's REPORT DATED MARCH 9, 2010

CLICK HERE FOR CEO's REPORT DATED APRIL 1, 2010

CLICK HERE FOR CEO's REPORT DATED SEPTEMBER 21, 2010

STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS FOR THE

REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES HELD IN ROOM 381B

OF THE KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION

500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

Tuesday, August 25, 2009

9:30 AM

S-2. Report by the Chief Executive Officer, in conjunction with the Chief Information Officer and the Director of Children and Family Services on various issues regarding the progress in enhancing and augmenting the County's Family and Child Index (FCI); and a report by the Acting County Counsel on the status of new legislation prepared at the direction of the Board to enhance and augment the current FCI system with data mining, any legal issues associated with full implementation of the FCI enhancement plan and any legal issues associated with a system that would enable the County to prioritize and deliver prevention and early intervention services to children and families, as requested at the meeting of August 18, 2009.   (09-1962)

Jacqueline White, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Patricia Ploehn, Director of Children and Family Services, Richard Sanchez, Chief Information Officer, William T Fujioka, Chief Executive Officer, and Robert Kalunian, Acting County Counsel, presented a verbal report and responded to questions posed by the Board.

After discussion, by Common Consent, there being no objection, the Chief Executive Officer's report was received and filed.

Attachments: Video
                    Audio

The foregoing is a fair statement of the proceedings of the regular meeting held August 25, 2009, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts, agencies and authorities for which said Board so acts.

Sachi A. Hamai, Executive Officer

Executive Officer-Clerk
of the Board of Supervisors

By _____

County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

November 2, 2009

To: Supervisor Don Knabe, Chairman
        Supervisor Gloria Molina
        Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
        Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
        Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
        Chief Executive Officer

STATUS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COUNTY'S FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S INDEX RECOMMENDATIONS

On June 30, 2009, on motion by Supervisors Antonovich and Yaroslavsky, your Board directed the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), in conjunction with all affected departments to:

1. Immediately implement the short-term recommendations contained in the June 12, 2009, report (attached) regarding strategies to increase the utilization of the Family and Children's Index (FCI), that do not require funding or legislative changes to implement, including mandating the use of the FCI by all affected County departments;

2. Report back to the Board within 30 days on the timeline required to implement any remaining short- and mid-term recommendations that do require the additional funding appropriated to FCI expansion; and

3. Report back to the Board quarterly thereafter on:

   a. Progress in implementing the short-, mid-, and long-term goals in the CEO's June 12, 2009, report;

   b. Progress in pursuing the legislative changes necessary for more comprehensive information sharing, which have been identified by County Counsel;

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are _Two-Sided_
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only

    c. FCI utilization rates by all affected departments; and

    d. Child safety outcomes and cost benefits.

Background

The FCI accumulates allowable basic family demographic information by receiving records that match certain Countywide "at-risk" definitions and participating department/agency-level at-risk indicators from their databases. The FCI (a pointer system) is designed to equip authorized users with the most comprehensive information available to them through the exchange of case-specific information with other participating departments/agencies. Once users are pointed to the correct departments/agencies, the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) requires that a Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDT) be formed to share confidential, substantive information about a family (unless there is some other legally permissible way to share that information). Participating departments include: Children and Family Services; District Attorney; Public Health; Mental Health; Probation; Public Social Services; and Sheriff. There are no non-County agencies participating at this time.

Update

Representatives from the participating departments, Internal Services (ISD), County Counsel, Chief Information Office, the CEO, and the Inter-Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN) are collaborating in this FCI implementation effort. A necessary step in the process was a review of the memorandum of understanding (MOU) and protocols for each participating department. Our efforts at startup were impacted due to the unanticipated need to make revisions to some of these documents.

Below, organized by strategy area, is an outline of significant action steps already completed; as well as timetables for pending activities necessary to achieve full implementation of FCI capabilities. In the context of our activities, full implementation means all present and/or future FCI departments/agencies:

1. Will import allowable data into FCI whenever records in their systems meet the County's at-risk definition and their departments/agencies specific at-risk criteria;

2. Must have staff available to answer questions about case-specific information during regular business hours and must develop the capacity to respond to requests for information during non-traditional business hours, weekends, and holidays; and

3. Are required, if needed, to have staff available to form MDTs to share confidential, substantive information about a family (unless there is some other legally permissible way to share information).

Strategy A: **Ensure full implementation of the existing FCI application and protocols for exchanging information among participating FCI agencies.**

Completed implementation efforts include:

1. On October 7, 2009, the CEO, District Attorney, ICAN, and Internal Services Department (ISD) presented the newly developed training module entitled *Understanding FCI* to the Children's Deputies and FCI participating departments/agency heads and/or their representatives. The training will be accompanied by an existing online training "video" that will walk users through a demonstration of the FCI application. Both modules will be hosted on the Department of Human Resources' (DHR) Learning Net website;

2. On October 14-15, 2009, the CEO revised the 2001 FCI MOU and developed a set of standardized protocols and presented the revised drafts of the FCI MOU and protocols to the FCI Manager's Team for their input;

3. On October 26, 2009, the CEO submitted a final draft of the revised MOU and protocols to County Counsel for their review; and

4. On October 28, 2009, the CEO instructed departments/agencies to identify staff to serve as members of FCI Trainer Teams.

Future implementation efforts include:

1. By the week of November 2, 2009, the CEO will ensure that the "on demand" FCI training modules are being hosted on the County's Learning Net;

2. By November 3, 2009, the CEO plans to execute the revised FCI MOU; clearing the way for training to begin;

3. By the week of November 9, 2009 through December 18, 2009, phased training of authorized FCI users will take place. The CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team will centrally support and monitor the trainings;

4. By November 13, 2009, CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team will implement a set of evaluation tools;

5. By December 18, 2009, all departments/agencies will have completed training of their authorized FCI users;

6. By December 30, 2009, the CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team will present a summary of the training results to Jackie White, Deputy CEO (DCEO) for the Children and Families' Well-Being Cluster; and

7. By January 29, 2010, with full implementation of the existing FCI application underway: (a) FCI-related Management Appraisal Performance Plan (MAPP) goals will be completed; and (b) FCI cost-sharing arrangements with ISD will be revised to reflect a more equitable distribution of ongoing maintenance costs.

Strategy B: **Expand FCI participation to other key County agencies with a link to child abuse and neglect and import allowable County information into the FCI.**

1. By February 5, 2010, the CEO, ICAN, and ISD will meet with the newly identified County departments/agencies to finalize their at-risk indicators and begin development of their FCI protocols;

2. By March 31, 2010, if evaluation data supports the feasibility of adding new FCI participating departments/agencies: (a) finalize the revised set of at-risk indicators for all; (b) develop a new set of protocols for participants; (c) execute a revised FCI MOU to include the newly identified County agencies; and (d) develop a training schedule for all new FCI users using the Trainer Team/County's Learning Net system;

3. By April 30, 2010, the CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team will: (a) draft the final set of FCI-related MAPP Goals for new County departments/agencies; and (b) revise the existing FCI cost-sharing arrangements with ISD; and

4. By June 30, 2010, the CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team will evaluate the participation of the new County departments/agencies in the FCI. Any corrective actions will be developed, if needed.

Strategy C: **Expand non-County agency participation in the FCI to the fullest extent allowed by the current WIC statute.**

1. By May 31, 2010, based on an outreach process by the CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Manager Team to at least two key non-County agencies: (a) complete an at-risk indicator and protocol development process similar to the one outlined above for County department/agencies; and (b) receive ISD and County Counsel's report on the technical and legal feasibility of having non-County agencies participate in the FCI; and

2. County departments/agencies; and (b) receive ISD's and County Counsel's report on the technical and legal feasibility of having non-County agencies participate in the FCI; and

3. By June 30, 2010, based on the outcome of ISD's and County Counsel's feasibility studies:

   a. Execute an agreement/contractual instrument between the County and at least two non-County agencies to participate in FCI;

   b. Ensure that non-County agencies assign staff to serve on the Trainer Teams and FCI Manager Team;

   c. Develop a schedule for non-County agencies to train all authorized FCI users using the same approach outlined earlier. All training activities will be centrally coordinated and monitored by the CEO, ICAN and the FCI Managers Team; and

   d. Revise the existing FCI cost-sharing arrangements with ISD.

Strategy D: FCI Technical Enhancements

Based on the current WIC restrictions, the CIO recommends performing a proof-of-concept process with software product(s) that can enhance FCI without violating the WIC code. Enhancements include name searches and matches and the graphic user interface.

Strategy E: Legislation

As Chair of the State's Data Committee, John Wagner, Director, California Department of Social Services, has offered his Committee's support to develop procedural, technical and legislative solutions to help the County facilitate the exchange of information among our departments/agencies. As requested, the CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team will document specific barriers/challenges to the sharing of information and will develop in partnership with the State potential legislative solutions to these issues.

Taken together, the technical enhancements coupled with improved quality of information and increased participation by County and non-County provider agencies in FCI will enhance the welfare and safety of children. Social workers investigating cases of alleged child abuse and neglect will have access to the most comprehensive information available to them via an enhanced FCI application and the information

exchange that occurs as a result. In addition, the implementation of these enhancements will help to clarify the roles that departments/agencies play in the identification, prevention, and treatment of child abuse and neglect.

As instructed by your Board, the CEO will continue to implement these enhancements and will provide progress reports on a quarterly basis. If you have any questions or need further assistance, please let me know or your staff may contact Jackie White, DCEO at (213) 974-4530, or via e-mail at jwhite@ceo.lacounty.gov.

WTF:JW:KH
CP:an

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
       Acting County Counsel
       Chief Information Officer
       Department of Children and Family Services
       Department of Mental Health
       Department of Public Health
       Department of Public Social Services
       District Attorney
       Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect
       Internal Services Department
       Probation Department
       Sheriff's Department

Attachment

Family and Children's Index (FCI)_Status Report_Board Memo_103009

County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

March 9, 2010

To: Supervisor Gloria Molina, Chair
        Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
        Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
        Supervisor Don Knabe
        Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
        Chief Executive Officer

STATUS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COUNTY'S FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S INDEX RECOMMENDATIONS

On June 30, 2009, on motion by Supervisors Antonovich and Yaroslavsky, your Board directed the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), in conjunction with all affected departments to:

1. Immediately implement the short-term recommendations contained in the June 12, 2009 report regarding strategies to increase the utilization of the Family and Children's Index (FCI), that do not require funding or legislative changes to implement, including mandating the use of FCI by all affected County departments;

2. Report back to the Board within 30 days on the timeline required to implement any remaining short- and mid-term recommendations that do require the additional funding appropriated to FCI expansion; and

3. Report back to the Board quarterly thereafter on:

    a. Progress in implementing the short-, mid-, and long-term goals in the CEO's June 12, 2009 report;

    b. Progress in pursuing the legislative changes necessary for more comprehensive information sharing, which have been identified by County Counsel;

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are _Two-Sided_
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only

c. FCI utilization rates by all affected departments; and

d. Child safety outcomes and cost benefits.

Background

Family and Children's Index is the name given to the Los Angeles County customized database authorized by the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) section 18961.5 enacted in 1992. The statute allows children services, health services, law enforcement, mental health services, probation, schools, and social services agencies within counties to share specific information about families who have had relevant contacts with these agencies and who have been identified as being at risk for child abuse or neglect. WIC 18961.5 requires each county to develop their own "at-risk" definitions.

The following Los Angeles County Departments/Agencies currently participate in FCI: Children and Family Services (DCFS); District Attorney (DA); Public Health; Mental Health; Probation; Public Social Services; and Sheriff (LASD).

Family and Children's Index serves as a "pointer" system to direct the authorized users of a participating agency to other County agencies who have had contact with the family subject to the initial inquiry. Once users are pointed to other agencies, WIC 18961.5 requires that confidential, substantive information about a family must be shared through the formation of Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs), unless some other legally permissible way to share that information already exists.

Family and Children's Index only accumulates that information specifically allowed by WIC 18961.5. It does so by receiving data from participating agency databases that meet the County's "at-risk" definitions. Each participating agency has its own internal FCI Protocol establishing that agency's "at-risk" indicators that fit within the County's "at-risk" definition. It is each participating agency's "at-risk" indicators which, in turn, determine the cases that are imported from the agency's database into FCI. In other words, when a child or family meets the County's "at-risk" definition, based on a participating agency's "at-risk" indicators, the participating department provides allowable information to FCI.

Los Angeles County's "at-risk" definition consists of:

1. All "substantiated" and "inconclusive" allegations of child abuse reported to a child protection agency;

2. Whenever a child is allegedly the victim of a crime; and

3. An event or fact involving a child or family member that, in and of itself, would not meet the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA) definition of child abuse nor trigger a mandated report, but which would, when combined with additional events or facts, raise a reasonable cause for concern that the family is in need of intervention or services to prevent the occurrence of child abuse and neglect as defined in CANRA.

Ultimately, FCI serves as a tool to assist in the investigation of suspected child abuse and neglect; and provides staff with a fuller picture of the child's and/or family's situation so they can make better informed decisions during the course of their investigations into alleged cases of abuse/neglect.

Update

Since our November 2, 2009 status report to your Board, the CEO, in conjunction with the Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN), Chief Information Office, County Counsel, Internal Services Department (ISD) and the FCI Managers Team (comprised of representatives from each of the seven participating FCI agencies) have achieved full implementation of the FCI application and process. In this context, full implementation means that all agencies: (1) import allowable data into FCI on a regular basis; (2) share confidential information with another participating agency, as a result of a matched FCI query, through the formation of MDTs (unless some other legally permissible way to share that information exists); and (3) maintain the capacity to respond to such requests on a 24/7 basis.

The CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team continue to meet twice a month to oversee the evaluation of the FCI application, execution of additional technical enhancements, inclusion of other County and non-County agencies as permitted by law, development of legislative changes, and maintenance of ongoing training efforts.

Summary of Accomplishments

Over the past three months, significant progress has been made to ensure that the FCI application is fully implemented and utilized. These efforts include: (1) completion of the FCI training to over 1,200 departmental staff; (2) execution of a FCI Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) containing a standardized set of protocols including a new 24/7 requirement; (3) submission of a set of legislative changes to seven child welfare-related statutes to remove barriers that restrict/limit information sharing between County agencies and other entities; and (4) creation of a set of measures and processes to evaluate the use of the FCI application and the timely exchange of information among participating agencies.

Below are details of significant steps completed, as well as timetables for pending evaluation, expansion and enhancement activities.

Implementation and Evaluation

Implementation steps completed:

1. On November 6, 2009, executed a new MOU among participating agencies. The MOU contains a set of standardized protocols and includes a requirement for all agencies to maintain 24/7 capability to respond to requests made for information by other participating agencies;

2. On November 12, 2009, the CEO, DA, ISD, and ICAN conducted the first in a series of FCI trainings to 117 staff from all participating agencies. This training was recorded by the Department of Human Resources and converted into an online FCI training module that is hosted on the County's Learning Management System;

3. On November 17, 2009, the FCI training module was ready for use by all FCI participating agencies;

4. On December 7, 2009, the CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team completed the development of a set of draft evaluation tools to measure the use of the FCI application and the timely exchange of information among participating agencies;

5. On December 28, 2009, the CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team developed a draft set of evaluation strategies that include monthly online user surveys and a structure for conducting monthly user focus groups;

6. On January 6, 2010, participating agencies developed a template of most commonly requested information. These templates were submitted to the CEO and ISD to prepare for technical enhancements that will further expedite the sharing of information; and

7. By January 27, 2010, FCI training was completed by 1,202 staff (361 more than had been originally anticipated) from all participating agencies. The three agencies with the most staff include: (a) DCFS: 947; (b) Probation: 101; and (c) LASD: 67.

   Results of pre- and post-tests indicate that trainees significantly increased their understanding of the FCI application/process as evidenced by an increase in their average overall scores from 60 percent to 92 percent.

Evaluation efforts underway:

1. By March 31, 2010, FCI user focus groups will be conducted. Data from these focus groups will be collated for inclusion in the first quarterly report covering the periods of January 1, 2010 to March 31, 2010;

2. By March 31, 2010, FCI user surveys will be distributed to a random sampling of FCI users; and

3. By March 31, 2010, FCI cost-sharing arrangements with MOU Departments will be reviewed to determine if a more equitable distribution of ongoing maintenance costs among participating agencies can be achieved. Once this is done, ISD will be notified to make any necessary adjustments to their billing for FCI support.

Expansion

Expansion efforts underway:

1. By March 31, 2010, in consultation with County Counsel, the CEO, ISD, and ICAN will meet with the new County departments/agencies to begin finalizing their "at-risk" indicators and developing their protocols;

2. By April 30, 2010, expand FCI participation to approved County agencies. Steps will include: (a) finalizing a set of "at-risk" indicators; (b) developing protocols; (c) identifying related costs; (d) executing a revised MOU; and (e) training staff; and

3. By April 30, 2010, in consultation with County Counsel, the CEO, ISD and ICAN will revise the "at-risk" indicators of participating agencies to enhance the information that is contained in FCI.

Future expansion efforts include:

1. By May 31, 2010, in consultation with County Counsel and based on outreach efforts by the CEO, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team will explore expanding FCI participation to include at least two key non-County agencies (e.g., law enforcement, schools, private hospitals, etc.); and

2. By June 30, 2010, expand FCI participation to at least two approved non-County agencies. Steps taken will be parallel to the ones described above for new County agencies, except that a contractual agreement between the County and non-County agencies will be developed.

Enhancements

Technical enhancements completed:

1. On November 5, 2009, ISD enhanced the FCI application by adding a new search function ("Soundex") that allows users to search for a client by the way their name sounds;

2. On November 30, 2009, ISD completed a capacity analysis of the existing server to test how many simultaneous users the FCI application can handle;

3. On January 5, 2010, ISD completed address standardization, validation and geocoding of the data currently contained in FCI to increase the accuracy of matches made;

4. On January 20, 2010, ISD enhanced the FCI "Query" screen to allow for better address search results;

5. On February 4, 2010, ISD modified existing FCI reports to enhance their clarity and provided administrative access to the CEO for accountability purposes; and

6. On February 28, 2010, the CEO in partnership with ISD and the FCI Managers Team implemented an online tracking log within the FCI application to collect data on when requests and responses for information between agencies occur. Live testing of this feature will soon be underway.

Technical enhancements underway:

1. By March 31, 2010, the CEO in partnership with ICAN and the FCI Managers Team will develop a user survey that will be distributed to a random sample of FCI users. An additional function will be added to automatically email surveys to users on a regular basis; and

2. By June 30, 2010, ISD will add evaluation-related tools to the FCI application that will *automatically* track: (a) when requests for information from other agencies were initiated; (b) the timeliness by which agencies responded to these requests; and (c) to the extent possible, how subsequent information shared was used.

Legislation

On January 20, 2010, County Counsel and the CEO worked in partnership with the California Welfare Directors Association to develop a bill that details a set of legislative changes to seven state child welfare-related statutes. This bill seeks to remove barriers that restrict or limit information sharing between County departments and entities authorized to investigate, prevent, identify, manage or treat child abuse or neglect. Additionally, the DA developed a bill to reduce the number of staff required to form a MDT from three to two, which would expedite the flow of information among FCI agencies. Both bills have secured sponsors.

Conclusion

Over the last three months, the CEO, County Counsel, ICAN, and the FCI Managers Team have worked closely to achieve full implementation and use of FCI. This has been made possible through a combination of efforts that include the development of: a new MOU; a set of standardized protocols, including the ability to respond to requests for information made by other agencies on a 24/7 basis; implementation of technical enhancements to improve matches; and creation of an online training module. As a result of these efforts, and in direct correlation with training of over 1,200 staff since November 12, 2009, there has been a marked increase in the use of the application as can be seen in the attached *FCI Queries Report.*

It is expected that the use of FCI will continue to increase as participation is expanded and technical enhancements are made. To better prepare for this expansion and establish an ongoing mechanism for evaluating the FCI application/process, a set of measures and technical enhancements to the FCI application will be implemented by no later than June 30, 2010. These additional efforts will enhance the way in which the FCI tool is used to identify, prevent, treat, and manage child abuse and neglect throughout Los Angeles County.

As instructed by your Board, the CEO will continue to report progress made on a quarterly basis. Our next status report will be submitted to your Board by April 30, 2010, and will focus on the results of evaluation efforts for January 1, 2010 through March 31, 2010.

If you have any questions or need further assistance, please contact me or your staff may contact Kathy House, Acting Deputy Chief Executive Officer at (213) 974-4530, or via e-mail at khouse@ceo.lacounty.gov.

WTF:KH:LB
CP:GS:hn

Attachment

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
    County Counsel
    District Attorney
    Sheriff
    Chief Information Office
    Children and Family Services
    Internal Services Department
    Mental Health
    Probation Department
    Public Health
    Public Social Services
    Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect

FCI Status Report_Board Memo_March 2010

FCI QUERIES REPORT

(For the Period of Aug.1, 2009 - Mar.03, 2010*)

Queries By Month

Year/Month	Total Queries	Number of Queries	Agency
2009 - 08	13,691	88	DA
		13,042	DCFS
		561	LASD
2009 - 09	16,251	126	DA
		15,389	DCFS
		736	LASD
2009 - 10	17,341	125	DA
		16,471	DCFS
		39	DPH-A
		706	LASD
2009 - 11	16,799	120	DA
		15,945	DCFS
		46	DPH-A
		37	ICAN
		651	LASD
2009 - 12	18,760	148	DA
		17,840	DCFS
		2	DMH
		70	DPH-A
		5	DPSS
		662	LASD
		33	PROB
2010 - 01	19,359	431	DA
		18,347	DCFS
		44	DPH-A
		5	DPSS
		526	LASD
		6	PROB
2010 - 02	19,729	563	DA
		18,502	DCFS
		67	DPH-A
		2	DPSS
		43	ICAN
		549	LASD
		3	PROB
2010 - 03 *	3,173	22	DA
		3,047	DCFS
		3	DPH-A
		1	DPSS
		83	LASD
		17	PROB
Total	**125,103**		

Queries By Agency

Agency	Total Queries	Number of Queries	Year/Month
DA	1,623	88	2009 - 08
		126	2009 - 09
		125	2009 - 10
		120	2009 - 11
		148	2009 - 12
		431	2010 - 01
		563	2010 - 02
		22	2010 - 03 *
DCFS	118,583	13,042	2009 - 08
		15,389	2009 - 09
		16,471	2009 - 10
		15,945	2009 - 11
		17,840	2009 - 12
		18,347	2010 - 01
		18,502	2010 - 02
		3,047	2010 - 03 *
DMH	2	2	2009 - 12
DPH-A	269	39	2009 - 10
		46	2009 - 11
		70	2009 - 12
		44	2010 - 01
		67	2010 - 02
		3	2010 - 03 *
DPSS	13	5	2009 - 12
		5	2010 - 01
		2	2010 - 02
		1	2010 - 03 *
ICAN	80	37	2009 - 11
		43	2010 - 02
LASD	4,474	561	2009 - 08
		736	2009 - 09
		706	2009 - 10
		651	2009 - 11
		662	2009 - 12
		526	2010 - 01
		549	2010 - 02
		83	2010 - 03 *
PROB	59	33	2009 - 12
		6	2010 - 01
		3	2010 - 02
		17	2010 - 03 *
Total	**125,103**		

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

April 1, 2010

To: Supervisor Gloria Molina, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S INDEX REPLACEMENT SYSTEM ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On August 18, 2009, your Board directed the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), in conjunction with the Chief Information Officer (CIO), and the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), to verbally report back on August 25, 2009 on its progress to enhance and augment the County's Family and Children's Index (FCI).

On August 25, 2009, your Board instructed the CEO to continue its efforts to enhance and fully implement the FCI "pointer" application. Additionally, the CEO was asked to research other computer systems that could potentially be used to enhance or replace the FCI "pointer" application. The CEO was instructed to report back to your Board with findings and recommendations based on the research conducted.

Overview of Models Researched

With the assistance of the CIO and DCFS, the CEO reviewed 11 systems from various jurisdictions around the country that use several approaches for sharing information. These systems and some of their key features are summarized in Attachment A, "Summary of Information Sharing Models". The document briefly describes each system, outlines major technical functions, identifies funding sources and costs, and describes mechanisms for addressing confidentiality and the sharing of information. Each system and their technical functions are compared against the legal and functional requirements of California Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) section 18961.5. This statute governs which technical functions may be used to enhance the County's FCI "pointer" application.

Research Findings

Based on the analysis conducted by our Office, in consultation with the CIO and County Counsel, two major conclusions have been reached: (1) none of the systems the team reviewed can be legally used to replace the FCI "pointer" application or used as the basis for establishing a comprehensive information sharing platform pursuant to WIC section 18961.5; and (2) your Board needs to make a policy decision on whether or not we should further explore the establishment of an interagency information sharing system that does not use the FCI "pointer" application as its foundation.

The FCI Statute

WIC section 18961.5 defines the function of the database as a "pointer" application, as well as the type of allowable information that can be stored in the FCI and outlines how case specific information can be exchanged. It is important to emphasize that any system, no matter how technically capable it may be, would be constrained by the same legal limitations that restrict the current FCI "pointer" application.

Specifically, WIC section 18961.5 authorizes counties to develop a database to serve as a pointer system. Currently, Los Angeles County is the only county in California that has developed a database, which is known as FCI. The law allows FCI to store limited client information and point authorized users of participating agencies to other County agencies that have had contact with the family. Once users are directed to these other agencies, the law requires that confidential, substantive information about a family must be shared through the formation of a Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT), unless some other legally permissible way to share that information already exists.

Allowable Information

WIC section 18961.5 requires each county to develop their own "at-risk" definition to determine which families' information will be entered into the FCI. Information stored in the FCI is restricted by WIC section 18961.5 to store only the following type of information:

A. The name, address, telephone number, and date and place of birth of family members;
B. The number assigned to the case by each provider agency;
C. The name and telephone number of each employee assigned to the case from each provider agency; and
D. The date or dates of contact between each provider agency and a family member or family members.

This information is then imported into FCI from participating agency databases as determined by each agency's internal set of "at-risk" indicators. More case specific information can then be exchanged through MDTs, unless some other legally permissible way of sharing information already exists.

Implementation of FCI

In the March 9, 2010 FCI Status Report, the CEO indicated that full implementation of the FCI "pointer" application had been achieved by having all participating County agencies: (1) import allowable data into FCI on a regular basis; (2) share confidential information with other participating agencies, as a result of a matched FCI query, through the formation of MDTs (unless some other legally permissible way to share that information exists); and (3) maintain the capacity to respond to such requests at any time, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

In addition to achieving full implementation and making some initial technical enhancements, other technical enhancements are underway to track and evaluate the timely requests, responses, and disposition of information shared among participating agencies. These enhancements are being implemented by the County's Internal Services Department, which is responsible for maintaining the FCI "pointer" application.

While some of the systems reviewed had several advanced features that might lend themselves to the type of enhancements being developed, a major drawback is that many of these features are bundled together as a package. As a result, this requires that an entire system be purchased in order to have access to the desired functionality.

Changing the FCI Statute

Given the parameters described above, WIC section 18961.5 would have to be substantially amended if the basic purpose or function of the FCI "pointer" application were to be significantly changed from a mere pointer system. For example, the statute would have to be significantly amended in order to allow FCI to access, exchange and store information with other County systems or use information stored in FCI to predict future instances of child abuse and neglect. However, modest changes to the law, such as enhancing the type of information that can be stored in the database would result in significant improvements for children and families by allowing social workers to have more detail about the family before they go out on an investigative visit to the home.

Currently, the CEO, County Counsel, and DCFS are engaged with State Assembly Member, Mike Feuer's office, to amend WIC section 18961.5 and four other related statutes (Attachment B). The proposed language would allow FCI to: store convictions for the 51 predicate offenses that are already imported from the District Attorney's office; store identifying information of nonfamily members residing in a child's home; and clarify and standardize who is allowed to participate in MDTs across each of the statutes. These

changes to the law reflect feedback received from participating FCI agency staff. In addition, the District Attorney has also introduced a bill to facilitate a more expeditious exchange of information among participating FCI agencies by reducing the number of members required to form a MDT from three to two. Ultimately, these changes would allow for better decisions to be made by social workers who investigate allegations of child abuse and neglect by facilitating the exchange of more comprehensive information on a timely basis.

Pursuing a County Information Sharing Portal

If your Board directs our Office to pursue this direction, there are a number of existing County-based systems and initiatives that are being developed that can serve as building blocks for this purpose (Attachment C). Additionally, several best practice models that address confidentiality and privacy concerns were identified as part of the research process and have been summarized in Attachment D.

One option to look at is an information sharing portal, which is similar to a Web-based search engine (as opposed to a centralized database system). Conceptually, a portal would allow authorized users to share data seamlessly across a defined continuum of care. Such a system would pull pre-defined case-specific information from various participating agency databases and assemble them into an electronic report that cannot be saved or stored on individual computer systems so as to protect the confidentiality and privacy of clients. Additionally, such a system could be enhanced by: creating controls that prevent waste, fraud, and abuse; providing information that is easily accessed and understood by authorized users; and generating paperless health and human service records to improve service delivery and reduce the total cost of care.

However, to develop such a comprehensive strategy, our Office, in consultation with the CIO, County Counsel, and other County departments currently planning or developing information sharing initiatives, will require concerted time and resources to thoroughly explore the feasibility of establishing an interagency information sharing portal. This will require a review of existing systems and opportunities, as well as an analysis of the numerous federal and State confidentiality and privacy laws that limit the sharing of information.

Additionally, other State and federal laws, such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, and the Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System requirements, will need to be reviewed and considered in the development of such a portal.

Admittedly the pursuit of a County information sharing portal is fraught with many challenges; however, the potential rewards of pursuing this strategy are worth the effort. Establishing such a system would increase systemic efficiencies and generate costs savings (as service duplication and fraud are minimized), improve the allocation of scarce resources, increase accountability, ensure that services are delivered in a more holistic and

client-centered way, and ultimately, assist clients to achieve better outcomes for themselves and their families.

Emerging Best Practice Model: New York City's Health and Human Services (HHS)-Connect

The State of New York and the City of New York are engaged in the development of an Information Technology infrastructure that closely mirrors the portal concept described above and enables the sharing of information across respective networks of care.

While many other HHS agencies have adopted this type of model, New York City has moved further along than any other jurisdiction in the country. As different systems and functions are being phased–in over time and HHS-Connect is completely implemented, the system will link more than a dozen City agencies so that caseworkers are able to share client information without compromising confidentiality. At the heart of the system is a common client index (CCI), which is a master registry of client links across several HHS programs. The CCI uses defined rules to match client records from different systems based on demographic data. To be included in a virtual, integrated, Web-accessible case file, clients would only need to provide their personal information once. Additional information, relevant only to specific agencies, will be collected on an as-needed basis.

Development of the system was facilitated by a series of executive orders that required all participating agencies to share their data (unless it was against the law). All agency directors were instructed to cooperate with the Office of the CIO for HHS. In addition, every participating director was required to attend all executive-level technology meetings; no substitute was allowed.

Through the development of a system that provides more comprehensive information about clients and families, agencies and providers can have a greater understanding of their circumstances. Consequently, they can deliver services in a more holistic and integrated way, which ultimately results in better outcomes for children and families.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis that led to the conclusions outlined above, it is recommended that your Board:

1. Instruct the CEO, in consultation with the CIO, County Counsel, and other County departments currently planning or developing information sharing initiatives to explore the feasibility of establishing an interagency information sharing portal (that does not use the FCI "pointer" application as its foundation). Such a portal should possess similar functionalities as those contained in New York City's HHS-Connect; and

2. Confirm the CEO's current direction to continue enhancing the FCI "pointer" application as outlined in the March 9, 2010 FCI Status Report; and to discontinue all efforts related to finding a system to replace its function as a "pointer" application.

If you have any questions or need further assistance, please contact me or your staff may contact Kathy House, Acting Deputy Chief Executive Officer at (213) 974-4530, or via e-mail at khouse@ceo.lacounty.gov.

WTF:KH:LB
CP:GS:hn

Attachments (4)

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
       County Counsel
       District Attorney
       Sheriff
       Chief Information Office
       Children and Family Services
       Internal Services Department
       Mental Health
       Probation Department
       Public Health
       Public Social Services
       Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect

FCI Replacement System Analysis and Recommendations_Board Memo

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION SHARING MODELS

FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S INDEX
OVERVIEW

The Family and Children's Index (FCI) is the name given to the Los Angeles County's customized database authorized by Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) section 18961.5, which was enacted in 1992. The statute allows each county to create a database based on its own standards for defining "at risk". Only information about children or the families of children at risk for child abuse or neglect may be entered into such a system. Also, the statute allows children services, health services, law enforcement, mental health services, probation, schools, and social services agencies within counties to share specific information about families that have had relevant contacts with these agencies and who have been identified as being at risk for child abuse or neglect.

Los Angeles is the only county in California that has created its own database. The database contains approximately two million records collected over a 10-year period. The **average yearly cost** to maintain the database is $326,300.

The FCI serves as a "pointer" system to direct the authorized users of a participating department to other county departments who have had contact with the family subject to the initial inquiry. Once users are pointed to the other departments, WIC 18961.5 requires that confidential, substantive information about a family must be shared through the formation of Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs), unless some other legally permissible way to share that information already exists.

The following Los Angeles County departments currently participate in FCI:

- Children and Family Services
- District Attorney
- Mental Health
- Probation
- Public Health
- Public Social Services
- Sheriff

The following is the only information permitted by law to be stored in the database:

1. The name, address, telephone number, and date and place of birth of family members.
2. The number assigned to the case by each provider agency.
3. The name and telephone number of each employee assigned to the case from each provider agency.
4. The date or dates of contact between each provider agency and a family member or family members.

Ultimately, **FCI** serves as a tool to assist in the investigation of suspected child abuse and neglect. It points staff to other County departments that have information about the children/families that they have come into contact with that have been identified as being at risk for child abuse/neglect. FCI provides staff with a fuller picture of the child's and/or family's situation so that they can make better informed decisions during the course of their investigations.

- Every county can have a computerized database pursuant to WIC 18961.5.
- **FCI** is not a **predictive** system. Information can only be obtained by authorized end-user querying the system.
- **FCI** is a **pointer** system that directs a user to an agency that has more specific information.
- There is **no case specific** information contained in the system.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION SHARING MODELS

	Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
1.	**Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania** **Department of Human Services** **Data Warehouse**	A data warehouse created to provide services more effectively and more efficiently and integrate the functions of the previously discrete human services departments. **Note:** Structure allows for the sharing of information because related departments have been placed under a single administrative umbrella to form a "super" agency. In 1997, 18 local foundations created the Human Services Integration Fund (HSIF) as a flexible funding pool to support projects and activities that foster integration/restructuring/service provision that are more difficult or impossible to accomplish with public sector dollars. **Start-up Cost:** Since 1997, they have spent over $3.2 million **Source of Funding:** $5.85 million from the Human Services Integration Fund (HSIF) within the Pittsburgh foundation **Yearly Cost:** Not known at this point **Source of Funding:** Not known at this point	Data is drawn from multiple agencies (public and private).	Yes	
			Shares client specific data (i.e., name, address, marital status, race, living arrangements, financial assistance information, etc.).	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
			Features a client matching algorithm to determine if client exists in another database.	No	• Client matches can be conducted on information received from other departments that are contained in FCI. • WIC 18961.5 only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
		Confidentiality: Because the five departments were consolidated into one Human Services department, all functions related to funding, data, personnel, and other administrative services were centralized, therefore eliminating the need for information sharing statues/polices within the department. Separate agreements/MOUs have been set up for other public/private agencies.	Provides centralized case management capabilities.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize a centralized case management system; it merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.

Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
2. **Enterprise Master Person Index (EMPI)** (Under development) **Start-up Cost:** $5.5 million has been committed for implementation **Source of Funding:** $1.8 million from CEO $1.8 million from CIO $1.8 million from Quality & Productivity Commission **Yearly Cost:** Not known at this point **Source of Funding:** Not known at this point	EMPI is a database application that will contain a unique identifier for every client/patient within a shared master person index for health care organizations. EMPI will automate appropriate medical, case, and service information and provides information across agencies in real-time. This product will be used to match and share information across multiple departments. The County has not yet selected or deployed an EMPI product. A selection committee has been tasked with finalizing a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a product selection. The initial user departments will be Children and Family Services (DCFS), Health Services (DHS), and Mental Health (DMH). There would be significant value to the County in later expanding use of EMPI to include Probation, Sheriff, and social services departments as well. **Confidentiality:** A client consent form will be used as well as contractual agreements between entities to ensure information is kept confidential and shared among authorized users only.	A unique identifier will be established for patients/clients receiving care or services in health care organizations. Once the EMPI unique identifier is assigned, it will be cross referenced to any existing or new patient/client identifiers across the agencies. EMPI will cross reference patient identifiers across multiple information systems to uniquely identify each patient, perform global patient searches and matching, consolidate duplicate patient records, create complete views of patient information and share data across multiple facilities and information systems in real-time. The role-based security features of the EMPI will allow the system administrator to effectively control access to Protected Health Information as defined by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and other sensitive information so that only authorized users with a clear job-related need for the information will be able to see it. The system can create seamless integration with existing departmental systems and across agencies.	Yes Yes No No No	• WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs. • EMPI could serve as a tool for MDT participants to identify and exchange more information with one another. • WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI. • WIC 18961.5 requires that information may only be entered into the system by provider agency employees designated by the head of each participating provider agency who shall establish a system by which unauthorized personnel cannot access the data contained in the system. Data is imported into FCI from existing provider agency computer systems.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION SHARING MODELS

Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
3. **Marion County, Indianapolis Dawn Project** **The Clinical Manager Program (TCM)** **Start-up Cost:** Price range $66,000 - $110,000 based on number of users **Source of Funding:** Jurisdiction's funding **Yearly Cost:** 16% of Total License Fee. $1,360 per day + Travel/Expenses for customization needs **Source of Funding:** Not known at this point	TCM is a software product created and used by the Dawn Project that serves as both a clinical, medical, and fiscal data sharing/tracking system. The system is used within a specified network of public and private entities and provides billing for health and mental health related activities, (i.e., Medicaid, private insurance). The TCM is available for purchase by other jurisdictions and can be adapted to another region's needs. Part of a three region initiative with: • Mass Mental Health Services Program for Youth (MHSPY) • New Jersey System of Care Initiative • Dawn Project **Confidentiality:** Informed consent form is used for clients. Confidentiality agreements exist between agencies that are part of the network.	Stores basic client level demographic information. Stores the following additional demographic information: • Assessments • Treatment Plans • Child and Family Team meetings • Clinical notes • Court reports • Utilization • Education Stores billing information.	Yes No No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI. WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION SHARING MODELS

Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no why feature cannot be used within FCI?
4. Long Beach Network for Health (LBNH) Initiate Software- MedPlus[1]	MedPlus is a Health Information Exchange software system allowing medical organizations to share/exchange patient data with the LBNH. The MedPlus clinical portal and data exchange engine is a web-enabled application supported by a federated data architecture. **Start-up Cost:** Information was not provided by organization **Source of Funding:** Information was not provided by organization **Yearly Cost:** Information was not provided by organization **Source of Funding:** Information was not provided by organization	Organizations within the network share comprehensive HIPAA-compliant patient clinical information in real-time.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize a health information exchange system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.
		Health care interoperability software stores identifying information (marital status, driver's license, gender, SSN, race, etc.). Other identifying information regarding patient care and services is included.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
	Confidentiality: Still resolving County Counsel data sharing issues. Some data agreements have been executed between participating health care agencies.	Real-time access to patient medical records for all authorized users.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
		Introduces electronic patient registration.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic client demographic information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Utilizes inpatient/outpatient medical remote coding.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic client demographic information to be stored within a database like FCI.

---

[1] LBNH was reluctant to provide budget information so as not to negatively impact their eligibility to bid for a County Health Information System RFP soon to be released.

Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
5. Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (LASD) CopLINK **Start-up Cost:** $7 million **Source of Funding:** $4.5 million - Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grants $2.5 million - LASD provided matching funds **Yearly Cost:** $420,000 **Source of Funding:** LASD provides ongoing maintenance costs	Created to assist investigators in solving crimes by providing information on persons, objects, location of contacts, and their relationships. **Confidentiality:** Memoranda of Understandings (MOUs) between agencies. **Note:** There are mechanisms in place to synchronize the restrictions so that CopLINK is in compliance with the source systems.	Uncovers hidden relationships and associations.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize an investigative system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.
		Draws data from multiple police agencies.	Yes	
		Contains copies of criminal documents.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Provides monitoring attributes.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize a proactive monitoring system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.
		Provides notifications for new activity (new data imported).	No	Data is imported into FCI from existing provider agency computer systems.
		Shares client specific data (i.e., name, address, arrest records, personal markings, photos, etc.).	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
		Customized reports (customized geographic reports, Hot spots, by region, activity, etc.).	Yes	

	Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
6.	State of Nebraska, Health and Human Services	N-Focus integrates individually maintained Health and Human Services programs into one automated system.	Users can access information via authorized staff. Any shared data, such as address, is available across the system.	Yes	
	N-Focus	N-Focus also automates the handling of client, resource, and payment information. Other N-Focus characteristics include: single access worker; interactive interview; expert system technology; on-line policy and help; alerts; seamless access to information; and client/server technology.	Users can access information via a master case or a provider.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
	Start-up Cost (1991 – 1998) $14.7 million: State General Funds; $27.2 million: Federal funds	**Confidentiality:** Nebraska's Health and Human Services departments are organized under one administrative structure. Contractors are authorized access based on job duties. Access can be at a local office site or via a secure web access using Citrix.	Nebraska uses Resource Access Control Facility (RACF) software to maintain security.	Yes	
	(1995-2003) $4.75 million: State General Funds; $11.85 million: Federal Funds; Total: $58.5 million		There are 42 different profiles that can be assigned to staff based on confidentiality regulations.		
	Source of Funding: Combination of Federal and State funds		The integrated database allows for a household's data to be entered once, and data is available to multiple users.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
	Yearly Cost: $13 – $14 million	Nebraska uses Resource Access Control Facility (RACF) software to maintain security. There are 42 different profiles that can be assigned to staff based on confidentiality regulations.	N-Focus determines eligibility and issues benefits (direct payments and provider claims) for over 39 programs.	No	Feature would require all departments' systems to be integrated; would need to overcome confidentiality laws.
	Source of Funding: Combination of Federal and State funds regulations.		Provides automated budgeting for programs.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic client demographic information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Access is controlled by a defined network of staff and procedures. Users can access information via a specific person, a master case or a provider. Any shared data, such as address, is available across the system.	Provides adult and child abuse/neglect tracking, access can be at a local office site or via a secure web access using Citrix.	Yes	
			Access can be at a local office site or via a secure web access using Citrix.	Yes	

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION SHARING MODELS

Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
7. **State of New Jersey System of Care Initiative²** **Absolute IS** **Start-up Cost:** Not provided **Source of Funding:** Not provided **Yearly Cost:** Not provided **Source of Funding:** Not provided	Clinical information system to manage and store child and family records. One protected electronic record keeps all child and family information in one place with the capacity for 4,000 users statewide to access these electronic records as needed. **Confidentiality:** Confidentiality agreements with each participating entity. Informed consent for clients.	Shares client specific data to be used to coordinate services across multiple agencies (e.g., assessment type, family size, benefit eligibility, and case level information).	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case demographic information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
		Data mining capabilities.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize a data mining system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.

---

² Numerous calls and emails were made to New Jersey and no response was received.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION SHARING MODELS

Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
8. **Pennsylvania County³ Child and Adolescent Service Program** **Performance Outcome Management System (POMS)** **Start-up Cost:** Not available **Source of Funding:** State Office of Medicaid **Yearly Cost:** $214,000 (2001) **Source of Funding:** State, and County as well as Medicaid	POMS serves as the database for the HealthChoices managed care system and produces a series of performance measures/indicators for the Pennsylvania Behavioral Health Managed Care Organizations (BHMCOs). POMS is a computerized registry of enrollees who have accessed behavioral health services. The registry is comprised of a minimum data set including clinical descriptions such as priority population and critical dates during the episode of care such as date of first service request, registration date and termination date. Data is submitted by the BHMCOs to the POMS central database. **Confidentiality:** Client enrollees consent forms. Contractual agreements between entities.	• Basic client level demographic information.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		• Registrations start and end dates; educational status and vocational status.		
		• Raw data elements on patient enrollees.		
		Stores mental health and substance abuse case information.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Stores treatment plans and priority target populations; child and youth, adult MH clients.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
		Stores child welfare status.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Stores juvenile justice status.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Creates and tracks measures/indicators for the Pennsylvania BHMCOs.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize a performance tracking system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.

---

³ Pennsylvania County Child and Adolescent Service Program has decided to restructure this system due to duplicative data and its inability to aggregate accurate data. Some functions of the system will be maintained such as the storing of treatment plans will continue to be used. Pennsylvania has run into issues with duplication of data and is revamping this system. However, some of the features here are worth noting.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION SHARING MODELS

Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
9. IBM InfoSphere⁴ Software **Entity Analytic Solutions (EAS)** **Funding** Not applicable	IBM InfoSphere Identity Insight Solutions formerly known as Entity Analytics Solutions. EAS detects and identifies a single person from multiple sources even if the data is insufficient, incorrect or fraudulent. EAS tracks their disclosed (and un-disclosed) relationships. The system is sequence neutral and self-correcting. EAS functions with streaming real-time analysis. The system has scalable entity resolution and analysis platform for fighting threat and fraud. It provides identity and relationship disambiguation technology combined with complex event processing. The system helps the public sector organizations and commercial enterprises recognize and mitigate the incidence of fraud and threat. Enables multiple organizations to selectively share data and leverage proprietary data to gain insight in a matter that never exposes sensitive information.	• Basic client level demographic information. • Registrations start and end dates; and vocational status. • Raw data elements on enrollees. • Global name classification, matching and searching. • Multi-attribute identity resolution. • Proactive intelligence during search.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		• Anonymous data sharing. • Full multi-attribute relationship linking across agencies. • Proactive discovery intelligence during search. • Tracks both disclosed (and un-disclosed) relationships and associations.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
		• Serves as an Early Warning System Proactive discovery. • Proactive perpetual identity based and transactional intelligence *PUSHED* to the people who need to know.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize a proactive warning system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.
		Stores child welfare status.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Stores juvenile justice status.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		• Utilizes analytical and predictive tools (Pattern Analysis and Modeling). • Streams Real-Time Analysis / Alerts. • Creates and tracks performance measures.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize an analytical or predictive or performance tracking system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.

---

⁴ The EAS application is an IBM system that is available for purchase and elements of the application have been implemented in Alameda County (Model 9a) and Carson County, Nevada (Model 9b).

	Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
9a.	**Alameda County, California Social Services Agency** **Social Services Integrated Reporting System (SSIRS)** **Entity Analytic Solutions (EAS)**	SSIRS utilizes elements of the IBM EAS system and creates a single view of the client and their relationships across several source systems for their data warehouse which is providing centralized reporting to case workers through Cognos. The data warehouse also includes case and transactional data from several production systems including CalWin, Probation, and Child Welfare System/Case Management System. Over 200 tables all resolved to the EAS unique person IDs.	Same as Model #9.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
			Same as Model #9, excluding Anonymous Data Sharing feature.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
		Confidentiality: MOUs have been developed between the social services agencies to allow for the sharing of client information.	Same as Model #9.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize a proactive warning system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.
	Start-up Cost Estimate $1.8 million		Same as Model #9.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
	Source of Funding CalWORKs Budget Allocation, Casey Foundation, and training budget		Same as Model #9.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
	Yearly Cost Estimate $563,000 **Source of Funding** CalWORKs Budget allocation, Casey Foundation, and State		Same as Model #9.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize an analytical or predictive or performance tracking system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.

Data System	Description	Technical Feature	Can feature be used within FCI? Yes/No/Limited	If no, why feature cannot be used within FCI?
9b. **State of Nevada, Carson County Division of Welfare and Supportive Services** **IBM Relationship Resolution Software** includes Entity Analytic Solutions (EAS) **Start Up Costs** FY 2006, $343,734 **Source of Funding** Federal Funds **Yearly Costs** FY 2007-$83,077 FY 2008-$126,140 FY 2009-$141,136 **Source of Funding** Federal and State Fund	The EAS repository stores demographic information only used to determine whether or not a person already exists in the system. Nevada built a front end web application that uses EAS to present back a list of possible matches that workers can use to make the determination to either add the person as new or match the person to someone who already exists. A better person resolution process reduced duplicate entries in the Nevada Operations Multi-Automated Data Systems (NOMADS). The web application allows the worker, if they have the authority to do so, to drill down further into a person's case information to help the worker determine whether this is the correct person. **Confidentiality** Case management system for social workers within the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services and information is not shared outside of the Division. Self contained case management system.	Same as Model #9.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Same as Model #9.	No	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI and only permits the exchange of additional information via MDTs.
		Same as Model #9, excluding Anonymous Data Sharing feature.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize a proactive warning system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.
		Same as Model #9.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Same as Model #9.	Limited	WIC 18961.5 only permits basic identifying client and case information to be stored within a database like FCI.
		Same as Model #9.	No	WIC 18961.5 does not authorize an analytical or predictive or performance tracking system. It merely authorizes a pointer system to direct users to other agencies with information about the client.

AB 2322
Information Sharing To Prevent Child Abuse and Neglect
Bill Summary

The bill seeks to make legislative changes to five child welfare-related statutes addressing information sharing between County departments and other government agencies.

Specifically, the bill amends all of the five statutes to make uniform the purpose and goal for which records are shared, including prevention, identification, management or treatment of child abuse or neglect.

Additionally, the bill substantially amends Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) section 18961.5 by expanding: 1) the type of data collected under this statute to include information on persons other than family members living in the home, as well as convictions of family members and persons that live in the child's home to provide better coordination between County departments and authorized agencies; and 2) the information sharing ability for the purpose of investigating or providing child welfare services to a child or child's family at risk for child abuse or neglect.

Below are the statutes being amended by this bill.

WIC Sections:

§ 830   Disclosure of confidential records relating to child abuse

§ 5328   Confidentiality of records; Authorized disclosures

§ 10850.1   Disclosure of confidential records relating to abuse of children, elders, or dependent persons

§ 18951   Terms used in chapter

§ 18961.5   Computerized data base system regarding at-risk families

Building Blocks:
Examples of Los Angeles County Information Sharing Applications

Enterprise Master Patient Index (EMPI) Application – Under Development

The EMPI is a database application that will contain a unique identifier for every client/patient in the enterprise. The EMPI concept is a state-of-the-art application utilizing a self-tuning internal matching algorithm. An EMPI will have one of the following matching algorithms:

- Deterministic indexing where one can search based on an exact match of the combination of name, social security number, date of birth and sex, or

- Rules-Based via the first four letters of the last name, or other key identifiers.

The best search mechanism is probabilistic searching via the soundex formula. This methodology improves the matching criteria.

A self-tuning algorithm will continuously tune its matching scores to the Los Angeles County population surnames. Over time, this application ensures the best possible results in linking personal records across the County enterprise.

Gartner, a technology industry tracking vendor rated both QuadraMed and Initiate (Initiate is another EMPI supplier recently purchased by IBM) EMPI solution highly.

Capabilities: This product would be used to match and share information across multiple departments. Note, the County has not yet selected or deployed an EMPI product. A selection committee has been tasked with finalizing a Request for Proposal for a product selection.

IBM Business Intelligence Software

The IBM/Cognos business intelligence toolset provides County departments with the following capabilities:

- Reporting that provides access to a complete list of self-serve report types and is adaptable to any data source for a variety of benefits, such as multilingual reporting, ad hoc query, and scheduling;

- Analysis that enables guided exploration of information that pertains to all dimensions of a department's business, regardless of where the data is stored;

- Business dashboards that communicate complex information quickly, translating information from various County systems and data into presentations using gauges, maps, charts and other graphical elements to show multiple results together;

- Balanced Scorecards that help align teams and tactics with strategy, communicate goals consistently, and monitor performance against targets; and,

- Extract, transform and load tools that extract data from various transaction databases, and transform the data into information for loading into reporting structures.

Capabilities: Business intelligence (BI) tools report, analyze and present data previously stored in a database, data mart or data warehouse. Multiple County departments now have the ability to utilize ISD's central BI infrastructure to build reporting databases, data marts or data warehouses for the sharing of information across County departments. IBM has a predictive analytical toolset, Statistical Package for Social Science that will be added to IBM's enterprise software agreement with the County for use in analyzing and predicting trends within data sets.

Oracle Database Software

Oracle Database Software manages and structures data held on departmental computers and provides the following:

- A database query language that allows users to interact with the database, analyze its data and update its content;

- Assignment of security that limits access privileges for changing data within the database; and,

- Computation for counting, summing, averaging, sorting, grouping, cross-referencing, etc.

Capabilities: Oracle databases are used by County departments for increased performance, scalability, security and reliability servers running Windows, Linux, and UNIX. It provides features to easily manage transaction processing, business intelligence, and content management applications. Oracle has high-performance data warehousing, online analytic processing, and data mining that can be accessed through the County's Oracle software license agreement:

- Oracle Data Miner provides a graphical user interface that helps customers mine their Oracle database to find valuable hidden information, patterns, and new insights; and,

- Oracle Spreadsheet Add-In for Predictive Analytics which enables users to mine their Oracle Database using simple 'one click' Predict and Explain analytics features.

SAS Data Mining Software

SAS data mining software extracts patterns from data to transform data into information. It is commonly used in a wide-range of profiling practices, such as surveillance, fraud detection and scientific discovery.

Capabilities: SAS provides a set of predictive and descriptive modeling algorithms such as: decision trees, gradient boosting, least angular regression, neural networks, linear and logistic regression, partial least squares regression etc. for fraud detection, and MediCal reimbursement matching by:

- Streamlining the data mining process to create highly accurate predictive and descriptive models based on analysis of vast amounts of data across the enterprise; and,

- Enhancing accuracy of predictions and sharing of reliable information, improving the quality of analytical decisions.

Summary of Best Practices for
Addressing Confidentiality and Privacy Issues to Promote Information Sharing

Allegheny County – Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
All five human services departments have been consolidated into one "super" department, therefore, eliminating barriers to sharing across multiple entities.

Separate agreements and Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) are used with other public/private agencies.

Enterprise Master Person Index (EMPI)
Client consent forms will be used, in addition to contractual agreements between entities. Information is only shared among authorized users (under development in Los Angeles County).

Marion County, Indianapolis – The Dawn Project
Client consent forms are used, in addition to confidentiality agreements between agencies within the managed care network.

Long Beach Network for Health (LBNH) – Initiate Software – MedPlus
Some interagency contractual agreements have been executed between the participating health care agencies. However, some data sharing issues for Los Angeles County are relative to its full participation.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) – CopLINK
MOUs have been executed between agencies.

State of Nebraska, Health and Human Services – N-FOCUS
All human services departments operate under one administrative structure, therefore, this eliminates barriers for sharing information across multiple entities.

Contractors are given certain levels of access based on job duties and confidentiality regulations. Access is controlled by a defined network of staff and procedures.

State of New Jersey System of Care Initiative – Absolute IS
Client consent forms are used, in addition to confidentiality agreements between agencies within the managed care network.

Pennsylvania County – Child and Adolescent Service Program – Performance Outcome Management System (POMS)
Client consent forms will be used, in addition to contractual agreements between entities. Information is only shared among authorized users.

Alameda County, California – Social Services Integrated Reporting System (SSIRS) - IBM
MOUs have been executed between social services agencies.

State of Nevada, Carson County Division of Welfare and Supportive Services – IBM
Case management system for social workers within the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services and information is not shared outside of the Division. Self contained case management system.

County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

September 21, 2010

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

APPROVAL OF MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT WITH THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S INDEX
(ALL DISTRICTS AFFECTED) (3-VOTES)

CIO RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE (X) APPROVE WITH MODIFICATION ( )
DISAPPROVE ( )

SUBJECT

Authorize the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to enter into a non-financial Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) to secure their participation in the County's Family and Children's Index (FCI).

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

Delegate authority to the CEO to negotiate and enter into a MOA between the County of Los Angeles and LAPD (Attachment). Execution of the MOA will secure LAPD's participation in the County's FCI application and data sharing process to investigate, prevent, identify, manage or treat child abuse or neglect and ensure the overall safety and well-being of children.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Your Board's approval will permit LAPD to participate in FCI by importing allowable data (described in California Welfare and Institution Code (WIC) Section 18961.5) into the

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are _Two-Sided_
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only

FCI pointer database. Allowable information will be extracted from LAPD records contained in the County's Electronic Suspected Child Abuse Reports (E-SCARS) database. The addition of LAPD E-SCARS information into FCI will enable the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) social workers and other participating FCI agencies to have a more comprehensive understanding of a family's situation during the course of an investigation into a case of child abuse or neglect. This information will allow for more informed decision making to ensure that children are kept safe from harm and that the needs of the family are addressed.

BACKGROUND

FCI is the name given to the Los Angeles County database authorized by WIC Section 18961.5. The statute allows children services, health services, law enforcement, mental health services, probation, schools, and social service agencies within counties to share specific information about families who have had relevant contacts with these agencies and who have been identified as being at risk for child abuse or neglect. The statute requires that each county develop their own "at risk" definitions.

FCI serves as a "pointer" database that directs authorized users of a participating agency to other participating agencies who have had contact with the family in question. Once users are pointed to other agencies, the statute requires that confidential, substantive information about a family must be shared through the formation of Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs), unless some other legally permissible way to share that information already exists. Ultimately, FCI serves as a tool that provides staff investigating a case of child abuse or neglect with as comprehensive a picture of the family as possible.

On August 11, 2010, a new FCI Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was executed among the following County Departments: (1) District Attorney (DA); (2) Sheriff; (3) DCFS; (4) Health Services; (5) Mental Health; (6) Probation; (7) Public Health; and, (8) Public Social Services. The CEO and the Interagency Council on Abuse and Neglect (ICAN) are also signatories on the MOU.

On April 27, 2010, the CEO and ICAN, in partnership with the DA, convened a meeting with senior LAPD officials to explore the Department's participation in FCI. The group determined that the most feasible way to proceed was for DCFS to extract legally permissible data from LAPD records contained in E-SCARS.

E-SCARS, managed by DCFS, is a web-based application that uses the Sheriff's secure network to link DCFS and the DA with all 46 Law Enforcement Agencies (LEAs)

in the County. Through this automated child abuse cross reporting system, the Child Protection Hotline is able to electronically transmit Suspected Child Abuse Reports (SCARs) to any one of the respective jurisdictions.

Working collaboratively, DCFS and the Internal Services Department (ISD) developed an automated approach to transfer allowable information from E-SCARS into FCI. It is anticipated that implementation of this automated transfer can occur relatively soon after the execution of the MOA. Once the proposed extraction method is tested and evaluated, it could be used to secure the participation of any other LEAs in FCI.

If your Board approves this recommendation, LAPD will be the first non-County agency to be integrated into FCI.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

The recommendation contained in this document will promote Countywide Strategic Plan Goals: 1) Operational Effectiveness; 2) Children, Family, and Adult Well-Being; 4) Health and Mental Health; and, 5) Public Safety, by coordinating the delivery of efficient and holistic services to children and families, based on a shared information based approach, to investigate, prevent, identify, manage or treat child abuse or neglect and ensure the overall safety and well-being of children.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

While this is a non-financial MOA with LAPD, the County will incur a total cost of $37,500. This cost will consist of two parts:

1. A one-time cost of approximately $22,500 to set up the automatic transfer of allowable FCI data from LAPD E-SCARS records into FCI. This includes: (a) $8,000 for DCFS to develop an automated program that extracts LAPD's information from E-SCARS; and (b) a one-time ISD fee of $14,500 to develop an automated program that imports LAPD's data into FCI and sets up LAPD representatives as FCI users. These costs will be fully offset by *Healthier Communities, Stronger Families and Thriving Children* (HST) funds.

2. An estimated maintenance fee of $15,000 will be charged by ISD to cover LAPD's first year of participation in FCI. This fee will be fully offset by HST funds. Future maintenance costs and the responsibility to fund those costs have yet to be determined.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

E-SCARS

E-SCARS facilitates compliance with the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA), Penal Code (PC) Section 11164, which requires: (1) DCFS and law enforcement to mutually cross report allegations of suspected child abuse and/or severe neglect; and (2) the DA to audit cross reporting compliance between DCFS and the LEAs in the County. E-SCARS will facilitate a timely response to sensitive cases, consolidate reports from multiple mandated reporters, provide case tracking capability, expedite criminal investigation, and enhance prosecution. Specifically, PC Section 11166(j)-(k) requires that a copy of the SCAR be transmitted to the DA and that police and child welfare agencies cross report to one another. E-SCARS allows for the electronic cross reporting of reports so that the requirements of the CANRA are fulfilled.

FCI

WIC Section 18961.5 authorizes counties to develop a database to serve as a pointer database. In Los Angeles County, this database is called FCI. The law allows FCI to store limited client information and points authorized users of participating agencies to other County agencies that have had contact with the family.

WIC Section 18961.5 requires each county to develop their own "at risk" definition to determine which families' information will be entered into the FCI. Information stored in FCI is restricted by WIC Section 18961.5 to store only the following type of information: (1) the name, address, telephone number, and date and place of birth of family members; (2) the number assigned to the case by each provider agency; (3) the name and telephone number of each employee assigned to the case from each provider agency; and, (4) the date or dates of contact between each provider agency and a family member or family members.

The information stored in FCI can only be accessed by designated provider agencies. WIC Section 18961.5 defines provider agencies as any governmental or other agency which has as one of its purposes the prevention, identification, management, or treatment of child abuse or neglect. Pursuant to WIC Section 18961.5 (h), provider agencies which may share FCI information shall include, but not be limited to: (1) social services; (2) children's services; (3) health services; (4) mental health services; (5) probation; (6) law enforcement; and, (7) schools. Therefore, LAPD is an allowable provider agency under WIC Section 18961.5.

The MOA has been reviewed and approved as to form by County Counsel.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The addition of LAPD E-SCARS information will enable DCFS social workers and other participating FCI agencies to have a more comprehensive understanding of a family's situation during the course of a child abuse or neglect investigation. It is vital that social workers and other FCI staff have as much information as possible about a family prior to any visits being made to the home. This information will allow for more informed decision making by the social worker to ensure that children are kept safe from harm and that the needs and best interests of the family are addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

WTF:KH:LB
CP:GS:mh

Attachment

c: Executive Office
County Counsel
Chief Information Office
Children and Family Services
District Attorney
Health Services
Internal Services
Mental Health
Public Health
Public Social Services
Probation
Sheriff
Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect
Los Angeles Police Department

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

FOR THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY
FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S INDEX

BETWEEN:
THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
AND
THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is to describe the framework for the use of the Family and Children's Index (FCI), establish the County's "at risk" definition, outline the City of Los Angeles Police Department's (LAPD) "at risk" indicator, ensure that confidentiality requirements are maintained, and affirm LAPD's commitment to fully participate in the County's FCI system. The parties to this Agreement are the County of Los Angeles, acting by and through its Chief Executive Officer (CEO), and the LAPD, acting by and through its Chief of Police (hereinafter the "Party" or "Parties").

2. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The FCI application is a computerized interagency database designed to better identify children and families who are at risk of child abuse or neglect. FCI stores basic allowable information about families and children that have had relevant contacts with public agencies and have been identified at risk for abuse or neglect. It authorizes users from provider agencies to obtain minimal identifying information regarding a child and child's family, as well as minimal information regarding another provider agency's contact(s) with a child and child's family. FCI also contains the names of the agency employee(s) assigned to the case. The data is imported electronically into FCI from existing provider agency computer systems. FCI allows professionals, trained in the prevention, identification, management and treatment of child abuse or neglect, and who are qualified to provide a broad range of services related to child abuse or neglect, to know when other agencies may have pertinent information about a child or family with whom they are involved in order to form Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs).

3. ENABLING LEGISLATION

3.1 In 1992, Assembly Bill 3491 (Gotch) was adopted by the State Legislature and signed by the Governor, which added Section 18961.5 to the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC). This section authorizes counties to establish a computerized database system within their county to allow specified

provider agencies to share certain identifying information regarding families at risk for child abuse or neglect for the purpose of forming MDTs.

3.2   Provider agencies are defined as governmental or other agencies which have as one of their purposes the prevention, identification, management, or treatment of child abuse or neglect. The provider agencies serving children and their families, which may share certain identifying information under WIC Section 18961.5 include, but are not limited to: (1) social services; (2) children's services; (3) health services; (4) mental health services; (5) probation; (6) law enforcement; and (7) schools.

3.3   WIC Section 18961.5 allows only the following information to be entered into the system: (1) the name, address, telephone number, and date and place of birth of family members; (2) the number assigned to the case by each provider agency; (3) the name and telephone number of each employee assigned to the case from each provider agency; and (4) the date or dates of contact between each provider agency and a family member or family members.

3.4   WIC Section 18961.5 requires each county to develop its own standards for defining "at risk" before joining this system. Only information about children and families of children at risk of child abuse or neglect may be entered into such a system.

3.5   The information may only be entered into the system by, or disclosed to, provider agency employees designated by the Department Head of each participating provider agency. Members of MDTs shall be drawn from these designated employees, or other persons, as specified in WIC Section 18961.5. Department Heads of provider agencies shall establish a system by which unauthorized personnel cannot access the data contained in the system.

3.6   The information obtained pursuant to WIC Section 18961.5 shall be kept confidential and used solely for the prevention, identification, management, or treatment of child abuse or neglect.

4.   GENERAL TERMS

4.1   The LAPD is a "provider agency" as defined by WIC Section 18961.5, and shall participate in and utilize the FCI system at no cost.

4.2   All parties shall fully implement this MOA within 30 days of its execution pursuant to LAPD's FCI Policy and Procedures (Exhibit).

4.3   This MOA may be terminated at any time without cause by either party upon giving at least sixty (60) calendar days prior written notice thereof to the other.

4.4   The LAPD may modify or amend its participation/responsibilities as outlined in the FCI Policy and Procedures provided that thirty (30) calendar days written notice is given to the CEO.

4.5   This MOA may be amended by mutual written consent of all parties.

4.6   This MOA will be reviewed on an annual basis by the CEO, the LAPD, and the FCI Managers Team as defined in Section 7.6, to ensure full participation of all parties.

4.7   This MOA is intended to define the working relationships among the parties related to the County's FCI system. It is not intended to modify, alter, or replace any separate agreements that exist between them.

5.   LOS ANGELES COUNTY'S "AT RISK" DEFINITION

The parties to this MOA agree that the County's definition of *"at risk"* includes:

5.1   All substantiated or inconclusive allegations of child abuse made to a child protective agency not including unfounded allegations, except if the risk assessment for the unfounded referral is high or very high risk;

5.2   When a child is a victim of an alleged crime; and

5.3   An event or fact involving a child, a child's family member, or a member of the child's household which in and of itself would not meet the definition of "Child Abuse" in the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA), Penal Code (PC) Section 11164 et seq., nor trigger a report pursuant to CANRA, but which would, when combined with additional events or facts, raise reasonable cause for concern that the family is in need of intervention or services to prevent the occurrence of child abuse or neglect as defined in CANRA.

6.   LAPD "AT RISK" INDICATOR CRITERIA

The LAPD will provide existing information, as set forth in Section 7.1.1 – 7.1.8 of this MOA, to FCI from the Electronic Suspected Child Abuse Report System whenever a child or the child's sibling has been named in a suspected child abuse report as a victim of physical or sexual abuse.

7.   LAPD RESPONSIBILITIES

The LAPD agrees to:

7.1 Provide on a regular basis as set forth in the LAPD's FCI Policy and Procedures, the following statutorily permissible information into the FCI system whenever a record in its database meets one or more of the LAPD's "at risk" criteria:

7.1.1 Name of child and/or family members;

7.1.2 Address of child and/or family members;

7.1.3 Telephone number of child and/or family members;

7.1.4 Date of birth of child and/or family members;

7.1.5 Place of birth of child and/or family members;

7.1.6 Case number assigned by the agency;

7.1.7 Name and telephone number of each employee assigned to the case from the agency; and

7.1.8 Date or dates of contact between the agency and a family member or members.

If the LAPD's case has been closed, then the LAPD will provide the name and telephone number of the LAPD contact person.

If the LAPD has incomplete information as to any of the above statutorily permissible types of information, the LAPD shall provide the information they possess.

7.2 Adhere, as outlined in the attached Exhibit, LAPD Policy and Procedures, to:

7.2.1 Providing information to FCI on a regular basis;

7.2.2 Properly accessing and using information contained in FCI;

7.2.3 Responding to calls made by other participating agencies in a timely manner;

7.2.4 Forming MDTs with other participating agencies;

7.2.5 Sharing case-specific information only as permitted by existing laws and through the formation of MDTs; and

7.2.6 Keeping information shared pursuant to the FCI statute confidential and used solely for the prevention, identification, management or treatment of child abuse or neglect.

7.3 Develop and maintain staff capability to respond in a timely manner to calls made by other participating FCI agencies as outlined in the attached Exhibit, LAPD Policy and Procedures. An inquiry should be responded to immediately, but most must be responded to within three business days of the time it was made.

7.4 Form MDTs as required by the FCI statute.

7.5 Keep FCI information confidential and only share information with other verified users as permitted by existing laws/statutes.

7.5.1 Unless the disclosure is otherwise permitted or required by law, a MDT must be formed in order to provide information that is protected, private or confidential. A MDT consists of three or more persons trained in the prevention, identification, management and treatment of child abuse or neglect, and qualified to provide a broad range of services related to child abuse or neglect; and

7.5.2 All parties will document any interagency contacts resulting from a FCI query.

7.6 Assign two LAPD staff to serve as responsible parties on the FCI Managers Team:

7.6.1 Program Manager; and

7.6.2 Policy Lead.

7.7 Program Manager Responsibilities include:

7.7.1 Ensuring that all existing/newly authorized FCI users are properly trained to access and use FCI as outlined in the attached Exhibit, LAPD Policy and Procedures.

7.7.2 Ensuring that the proper orientation, training, and transition of a FCI Program Manager and Policy Lead occur whenever FCI Program Managers or Policy Leads are replaced.

7.7.3 Auditing and updating LAPD user lists and information provided to FCI on a monthly basis and coordinating these efforts with the County's Internal Services Department (ISD) to ensure proper

access and security of authorized use of the FCI system as well as up-to-date FCI information.

    7.7.4 Coordinating LAPD compliance with FCI evaluation efforts, developed by the CEO in conjunction with the Inter-Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN) and the FCI Managers Team, in order to maximize agency participation in the FCI system. LAPD agrees to develop evaluation tools that are in compliance with the FCI Managers Team's efforts. Considerations in developing evaluation tools are: (1) the burdensome nature of the evaluation tool; (2) impact on the work of the agency; and (3) the value of the information sought balanced against the potential added workload to the participating agency.

7.8   Policy Lead responsibilities include serving as a liaison between the FCI Managers Team and their agency's executive staff on funding, legislative, operational, and policy related matters.

8. CEO RESPONSIBILITIES

The CEO's responsibilities will include, but are not limited to:

8.1   Co-Chairing the FCI Managers Team in conjunction with ICAN;

8.2   Conducting, in conjunction with ICAN, outreach and recruitment of additional FCI participating agencies;

8.3   Monitoring FCI evaluation efforts and working with ICAN to coordinate and design tools to evaluate FCI;

8.4   Approving changes/amendments to the MOA;

8.5   Coordinating the development and facilitation of FCI training with ICAN and the FCI Managers Team;

8.6   Partnering with ISD and all participating agencies to ensure ongoing maintenance support of FCI hardware/software, implementation of technical enhancements, and development of ad hoc reports; and

8.7   Providing regular status reports to the Board of Supervisors regarding FCI implementation and progress made.

9. CONFIDENTIALITY AND USE OF INFORMATION ON FCI

The parties to this MOA agree to:

9.1 Only provide information to be exported to FCI by, or be disclosed to, agency employees designated by the Department Head of the participating provider agency. Members of MDTs shall be drawn from these designated employees, or other persons, as specified in WIC Section 18961.5 (d);

9.2 Establish a system by which unauthorized personnel cannot access the data contained in the FCI system; and

9.3 Keep the information contained in FCI confidential and solely used for the creation of MDTs for the prevention, identification, management, or treatment of child abuse or neglect, or both. Every employee with access to FCI will take an oath of confidentiality and have a confidentiality statement on file with their employer agency.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this MOA for the Family and Children's Index as of the _____ day of _____ 2010.

William T Fujioka   Charlie Beck, Chief of Police
Chief Executive Officer   Los Angeles Police Department
Los Angeles County

Los Angeles County
Family and Children's Index (FCI)
Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD)
Policy and Procedures

I. PURPOSE
The purpose of this document is to establish policy and procedures for the use of FCI.

II. OVERVIEW
The FCI system is a computerized interagency database designed to better identify children and families who are at risk of child abuse or neglect. FCI stores basic allowable information about families and children that have had relevant contacts with public agencies and have been identified at risk for abuse or neglect. It authorizes users from provider agencies to obtain minimal identifying information regarding a child and child's family as well as minimal information regarding another provider agency's contact(s) with a child and child's family. FCI also contains the names of the agency contact person for pursuing further information. The data is imported into FCI from existing provider agency computer systems. FCI allows professionals trained in the prevention, identification, management, and treatment of child abuse or neglect, and qualified to provide a broad range of services related to child abuse or neglect, to know when other agencies may have pertinent information about a child or family with whom they are involved.

III. BACKGROUND
On August 11, 2010, a new FCI Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was executed by the following County agencies:

1. Chief Executive Office (CEO);
2. Office of the District Attorney (DA);
3. Sheriff's Department (SD);
4. Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS);
5. Department of Health Services (DHS);
6. Department of Mental Health (DMH);
7. Probation Department;
8. Department of Public Health (DPH);
9. Department of Public Social Services (DPSS); and
10. Inter-Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN).

IV. ENABLING LEGISLATION
FCI is an existing interagency computerized database whose creation was authorized by Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Section 18961.5. Essentially, the statute allows children services, health services, law enforcement, mental health services, probation, schools, and social services agencies within counties to have the ability to share specific identifying information of families at risk for child abuse or neglect for the

purpose of forming Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs) for the prevention, identification, management or treatment of child abuse or neglect.

V. INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY LAPD

As a FCI participating provider agency, LAPD agrees to provide, on a regular basis, the following statutorily permissible information into the FCI system whenever a record in its database(s) meets the County's "at risk" definition (see below) and LAPD's "at risk" criteria:

1. Name of child and/or family members;
2. Address of child and/or family members;
3. Telephone number of child and/or family members;
4. Date of birth of child and/or family members;
5. Place of birth of child and/or family members;
6. Case number assigned by the agency providing the data;
7. Name and telephone number of the contact person(s) for the agency (Agency Contact) who would be responsible for providing further information; and
8. Date(s) of contact between the agency providing data and a family member or members.

If any agency has incomplete information as to any of the allowable types of information, the agency shall transmit the information they possess.

VI. LOS ANGELES COUNTY'S "AT RISK" DEFINITION

LAPD agrees that the County's "at risk" definition includes:

1. All substantiated or inconclusive allegations of child abuse made to a child protective agency not including unfounded allegations, except if the risk assessment for the unfounded referral is high or very high risk;

2. When a child is a victim of an alleged crime; and

3. An event or fact involving a child, a child's family member, or a member of a child's household which in and of itself would not meet the definition of "Child Abuse" in the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA), Penal Code (PC) Section 11164 et seq., nor trigger a report pursuant to CANRA, but which would, when combined with additional events or facts, raise reasonable cause for concern that the family is in need of intervention or services to prevent the occurrence of child abuse as defined in CANRA.

VII. LAPD'S "AT RISK" INDICATOR CRITERIA

LAPD will provide statutorily permissible information (as set forth in Section V above) to FCI from the Electronic Suspected Child Abuse Report System, whenever a child or the child's sibling has been named in a suspected child abuse report as a victim of physical or sexual abuse.

VIII. ACCESSING AND USING FCI INFORMATION
LAPD JUVENILE DIVISION RESPONSIBILITIES
Juvenile Division shall be LAPD's central contact for the participating provider agencies listed in the MOA. Juvenile Division shall be responsible for processing all documentation for FCI users. Juvenile Division shall make every effort to answer and respond to all calls it receives on an inquiry, and provide the caller with the following requested information:

1. The investigating officer's name and telephone number; and
2. Any follow-up information, if needed.

FCI LIAISON'S RESPONSIBILITIES
Juvenile Division will designate a Bureau Consultant as its FCI Liaison.

The FCI Liaison shall determine which employee(s) shall have access to FCI, and shall ensure that all FCI users, assigned to Juvenile Division, have signed a FCI Confidentiality Statement form. This form can be obtained by contacting the FCI Liaison who shall maintain custody and control of all confidentiality forms.

The FCI Liaison shall be responsible for ensuring that all users within their unit are using the program in accordance with the MOA. A copy of the MOA is available from the FCI Liaison. The FCI Liaison shall either provide the requested information themselves or designate someone to provide the information.

If a Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) Case Worker requests LAPD's Crime Report information for an emergency response, the FCI Liaison and/or other authorized Juvenile Division personnel shall provide the requested information as soon as possible.

USER'S RESPONSIBILITIES
Each FCI user shall read and complete the FCI Confidentiality Statement form. Each user shall use the FCI program in accordance with the MOA.

RELEASE/RECEIPT OF INFORMATION
The FCI Liaison, or his/her designee, shall release information to any authorized caller from the District Attorney (DA), DCFS or the Sheriff's Department (SD) without forming a MDT. An inquiry by the DA, DCFS, or the SD does not constitute the formation of a MDT, and does not require a Contact Sheet.

LAPD is permitted to *receive* information from the DA or the SD without forming a MDT.

If LAPD is requesting information from DCFS, Department of Health Services (DHS), Department of Mental Health (DMH), Department of Public Health (DPH), Department of Public Social Services (DPSS), or the Probation Department, LAPD must establish a MDT before these County departments can share information, unless the disclosure is otherwise permitted or required by law. For example, WIC section 827 allows DCFS and Probation to share information with law enforcement agencies in certain instances, and WIC section 10850 allows DPSS to share information with law enforcement agencies in certain instances.

If DCFS, DHS, DMH, DPH, DPSS, or the Probation Department request information from LAPD's Juvenile Division personnel, it is LAPD's responsibility to determine whether a MDT is needed, and provide the personnel necessary to participate in the MDT.

When LAPD forms or participates in a MDT, a MDT Contact Sheet shall be completed.

The MDT Contact Sheet shall contain the following:

1. The LAPD employee's name and employee number, either giving or receiving the information;
2. The date and time of the call;
3. The employee name, employee number, and the provider agency name of all parties involved in the MDT;
4. The report number; and,
5. The name and date of birth of all children who were the subject of the inquiry.

The MDT Contact Sheet shall be maintained by the FCI Liaison.

IX. RESPONDING TO REQUESTS MADE FROM OTHER AGENCIES
Response Time
> An inquiry should be responded to immediately, but in no case shall such a response be provided more than three business days from the date and time the inquiry is made.
>
> **NOTE:** LAPD personnel are available Monday through Friday, from 5:30 AM until 12:00 AM. Limited staffing is available on Saturdays from 12:00 PM until 10:00 PM to respond to inquiries.

Verifying Users
> The Agency Contact needs to verify that the person calling or emailing is a legitimate user of the system. Please refer to the *Verification of FCI Users* section below for a detailed description of the verification process.

Security Note
> Sending case history information via Email or an insecure FTP/telnet protocol is not secure and is ***strictly prohibited.*** Only use the agency client number in an email when referring to a child. Please see *Confidentiality And Use Of Information On FCI* section below for additional information.

X. VERIFICATION OF FCI USERS
The Agency Contact needs to verify that the person calling or emailing is a legitimate user of the system:

Log into the FCI system.

1. Look for the person in the 'List of Users'.

a. If the person making the inquiry is not on this list, inform the person that he/she needs to get approval from his/her agency's FCI Program Manager in order to gain access to the system.
b. The contact information for an agency's FCI Program Manager can be obtained by clicking on the 'Quick Reference' link at the top of the 'User List' screen.
c. If the person making the inquiry is from an agency that is not listed in the 'Agency Program Managers' section of the 'Quick Reference' screen, then his/her agency is not one of the participating agencies. If this is the case, please direct this person to the LAPD's FCI Program Manager.

2. If the inquiry is made via phone, ask the user his/her 'Verification Question' located to the far right hand side of the 'User List' screen.

a. If the person is listed as a user, yet he/she does not have a verification question in the 'Q/A' column, instruct the user to log into the FCI system and create one. He/She can do so by logging in, scrolling down to the bottom of the screen, clicking on 'INFORMATION & OPTIONS' and then choosing 'CHANGE YOUR VERIFICATION QUESTION'.
b. If the user has never activated his/her account, he/she can view a quick tutorial on how to do so at http://fci.co.la.ca.us/training/.

3. If an inquiry is made via email, find user in the 'User List'; call the person and proceed as if the inquiry were made via phone.

4. If the account of a user making an inquiry is disabled, contact the LAPD FCI Program Manager and inform them of the situation with the name and agency of the user.

5. Document all inquiries in an internal reporting system.

XI. CONFIDENTIALITY AND USE OF INFORMATION ON FCI

1. As a participating provider agency, LAPD agrees that information may only be entered into FCI by, or disclosed to, agency employees designated by the Director of the participating agency. Members of MDTs shall be drawn from these designated employees, or other persons, as specified in WIC Section 18961.5 (d). Participating agencies shall establish a system by which unauthorized personnel cannot access the data contained in the system. The information contained in FCI shall be kept confidential and shall be used solely for the prevention, identification, management, or treatment of child abuse or neglect. Every employee with access to FCI will have taken an oath of confidentiality and have a confidentiality statement on file with their employer agency;

2. Request for physical case history files will have to be made pursuant to individual agency rules and protocols. Files should NEVER be transmitted through email or unsecured FTP/telnet protocols; and

3. It is important to be aware of what the LAPD's criteria are for a record to be in the FCI. If an inquiry is received from a FCI user on a child that does not show a match for the LAPD or there is no match in the index at all, no information can be given out. Check with your agency's FCI Program Manager if you have any doubts as to when to give out information or not.

If you have a reasonable belief that the child's life is in danger
SHARE INFORMATION!

XII. FORMATION OF MDTs

Unless the disclosure is otherwise permitted or required by law, a MDT must be formed in order to provide information that is protected, private or confidential.

When contacting DHS, DMH, or DPH, the contacts from these participating provider agencies have been instructed to assure and document that a MDT is formed before further investigation occurs. The MDT can include the person who is making the inquiry, the person to whom the Agency Contact has referred the person making the inquiry within their agency who would have the specific case history information (in some cases, this may be the Agency Contact), and one other person from either the "queried" agency (i.e., the Agency Contact's supervisor) or the "querying" agency (i.e., the supervisor of the person making the inquiry) stating that a FCI search was conducted and further information is being requested. See below for specific requirements for MDTs.

1. MDT means any team of three or more persons who are trained in the prevention, identification, management, and treatment of child abuse or neglect cases and who are qualified to provide a broad range of services related to child abuse. The MDT may include but is not limited to:

   a. Psychiatrists, psychologists, marriage and family therapists, or other trained counseling personnel;
   b. Police Officers or other law enforcement agents;
   c. Medical personnel with sufficient training to provide health services;
   d. Social Workers with experience or training in child abuse prevention; and
   e. Any public or private school teacher, administrative officer, supervisor of child welfare and attendance, or certificated pupil personnel employee.

2. MDTs can be formed on the telephone and/or in person.

3. The FCI statute requires that a MDT consisting of at least three members (as described in #1 above) be formed before any confidential information is shared.

4. If there is a statute that allows or requires the sharing of information, then no MDT may be needed. If you are in doubt, please contact the LAPD FCI Program Manager or LAPD's advice counsel.